

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MARIYAM AKMAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C12-1499RSL

ORDER DENYING REQUEST
FOR SERVICE

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's request for service of a subpoena duces tecum by the U.S. Marshal's Service (Dkt. # 53). Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*. Having considered Plaintiff's request, the Court finds as follows:

(1) On October 2, 2013, this Court granted in part Plaintiff's requests for service of two subpoenas duces tecum under Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Because Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis*, she is entitled to have a U.S. Marshal effect service of a subpoena duces tecum issued by the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d); see also Frazier v. Redding Police Dept., 2012 WL 5868573, at *8 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2012). However, Plaintiff failed to provide sufficient information for the U.S. Marshal to serve one of the subpoenas. Dkt. # 52 at 2. In its Order, the Court stated that Plaintiff could submit another request for service of a subpoena on the Transportation Security Administration's ("TSA") Human Resources Department by the U.S. Marshal, but the Court expressly instructed Plaintiff that "the subpoena must include a complete street

1 address for service and allow a reasonable amount of time for the recipient to comply in
2 light of the additional time necessary for the U.S. Marshal to effect service.” Id.

3 (2) Although Plaintiff has now provided a complete street address for service, she
4 has not provided a reasonable amount of time for the recipient to comply with the
5 subpoena. See Dkt. # 53-1 at 1. The subpoena Plaintiff seeks to have served commands
6 the custodian of records for TSA to produce documents by 11:59 p.m. on October 9,
7 2013. Id. Because that date has passed, the Court DENIES Plaintiff’s request for
8 service by the U.S. Marshal (Dkt. # 53).

9 (3) Plaintiff may file a third request for service of the subpoena, but she must
10 provide a complete street address for service and adjust the deadline for compliance in
11 the subpoena to provide a reasonable amount of time within which to respond.

12 DATED this 21st day of October, 2013.

13
14
15 

16 Robert S. Lasnik
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26